

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The specification is objected to as allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for “computer readable medium,” as claimed. Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

The Examiner is directed to page 36 of the instant application disclosing that the handheld computer includes a processor coupled to a first memory (non-volatile) and a second memory (volatile) (see instant application, page 36, lines 6-8). The memories disclosed within the handheld computer and provide a medium for storing information. Accordingly, the memories disclosed are “computer readable medium,” as claimed. As such, withdrawal of the objection is earnestly solicited.

The drawings are objected to for containing informal labels. Applicants respectfully submit that formal drawings will be submit once the instant application is in condition for allowance. As such, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10-11 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite for insufficient antecedent basis. Applicants have

amended Claims 10 and 11 to recite “said operation,” as claimed instead of “said action.” As such, withdrawal of the rejection is earnestly solicited.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-20 and 25-29 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being allegedly unpatentable over Uusimaki Matti (EP 1 107 101 A2) (hereinafter Matti) in view of Eromaki Marko et al., (EP 1 051 012 A2) (hereinafter Marko). Applicants respectfully traverse in view of the following.

The rejection admits that Matti fails to teach a module for performing an operation based on a selection of information displayed on a display, and wherein the operation is based on content of the selection of information displayed on the display, as claimed. The rejection relies on Marko. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the following.

Marko discloses a portable electronic device with an attached sliding attached touch screen and a sliding lid having a keyboard on top thereof (see Marko, page 1). Marko further discloses that the sliding touch screen and the sliding lid having a keyboard can move away, thereby revealing more of the display (see Marko, page 1). Marko discloses that in a closed configuration, the user may use a small display and a small keyboard while in the open

configuration the user can use the more complete keyboard or an extended display (see Marko, paragraph 23).

Accordingly, Marko discloses a first movable sliding portion having a display and a second sliding portion having a keyboard. Moreover, Marko discloses that the user may use the keyboard on the second sliding portion in various configurations, e.g., closed and open. As such, Marko fails to teach or suggest that the operation is based on a selection of information displayed on the display at a relative position of the sliding component with respect to the display as determined coincident with the signal, and wherein the operation is based on a content of the selection of information displayed on the display, as claimed.

Accordingly, Matti alone or in combination with Marko fails to render independent Claim 1 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Independent Claims 8 and 25 recite limitations similar to that of Claim 1, as presented above, and are patentable for similar reasons. For example, Claims 8 recites detecting a user selecting the portion of the information, wherein the selection is made by using at least one button input residing on the sliding component, as claimed. Moreover, Claim 8 recites invoking an operation related to a content of the selected portion of the information, as claimed. Claim 25 recites that the position of the sliding component is further for identifying a graphical element, for selection by a user, from said plurality of graphical elements, as claimed. Moreover, Claim 25 recites

performing an operation associated with the graphical element based on a content of the graphical element, as claimed. Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 16 recites generating a visual output on the display that is arranged and repositioned to be viewable in response to a relative position of a sliding component, as claimed.

The rejection admits that Matti fails to teach performing an operation in response to a signal, as claimed with respect to Claim 1. Thus, Matti also fails to teach generating a visual output on the display that is arranged and repositioned to be viewable in response to a relative position of a sliding component, as claimed because as admitted by the rejection Matti fails to teach performing an operation in response to a signal.

As presented above, Marko discloses a first movable sliding portion having a display and a second sliding portion having a keyboard. Moreover, Marko discloses that a user may use the keyboard on the second sliding portion in various configurations, e.g., closed and open. As such, Marko fails to teach or suggest generating a visual output on the display that is arranged and repositioned to be viewable in response to a relative position of a sliding component, as claimed.

Accordingly, Matti alone or in combination with Marko fails to render independent Claim 16 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency. Independent Claim 25 recites limitations similar to that of Claim 16, as presented and discussed above. For example, Claim 25 recites that the processor is operable to reposition the plurality of graphical elements responsive to the position of the sliding component with respect to the display, as claimed. As such, independent Claim 25 is further patentable over the cited combination for reasons similar to that of Claim 16.

As per Claim 2, the rejection asserts that a display switch for changing the size of the display area is considered as the visual configuration action. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, a cover may mask a portion of a display, thereby reducing the viewable size. However, masking a portion of a display does not configure data rendered on the display, as claimed. For example, covering a portion of the display does not change or move content rendered on the display. As such, Matti fails to teach or suggest that the operation is a visual configuration of data rendered on the display, as claimed. Claims 19, 20 and 29 are patentable for similar reasons.

As per Claim 3, Matti discloses an antenna (see Matti, Figure 1, element 29). However, an antenna, as disclosed by Matti, does not teach or suggest that

the operation is an initiation of communication with another device using the wireless device, as claimed. For example, the antenna may simply be used to receive data automatically without initiation of a communication, as claimed. As such, a mere disclosure of an antenna, as disclosed by Matti, fails to teach or suggest that the operation is an initiation of communication with another device using said wireless transmitter, as claimed.

As per Claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that Matti fails to teach or suggest the operation in the claimed fashion for reasons similar to that of Claim 3, as presented and discussed above. As such, Matti fails to teach or suggest that the operation is an initiation of communication with an external device, as claimed.

Claims 9-10 recite limitations similar to that of Claims 1-3 and are patentable for similar reasons.

As per Claim 11, Matti in view of Marko fails to teach or suggest performing an operation in response to a signal, wherein the operation is based on a selection of information displayed on the display, and wherein the operation is based on a content of the selection of information displayed on the display, as recited by Claim 1. Thus, Matti in view of Marko similarly fails to teach or suggest

that the operation is a display of related additional information to the portion of the information, as claimed under similar rationale.

As per Claim 12, Matti in view of Marko fails to teach or suggest that the operation is based on a selection of information displayed on the display, as recited by Claim 1. Thus, Matti in view of Marko also fails to teach or suggest that the selection is via a key, as recited by Claim 12. Under similar rationale, Matti in view of Marko similarly fail to teach or suggest that the sliding component is operable to accept a user input to effect the selection, as recited by Claim 28.

Claims 17-20 recite limitations similar to that of Claims 9-11 and are patentable for similar reasons.

As such, allowance of Claims 1-20 and 25-29 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §103.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-20 and 25-29 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of Claims 1-20 and 25-29 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 03-16- 2009

/Amir A. Tabarrok/
Amir A. Tabarrok
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile